



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,369	01/26/2001	Joseph Goldenburg	4450-0398P	7923

2292 7590 11/26/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/770,369

Applicant(s)

GOLDENBURG ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The reply filed on 10/09/03 consists of addition of new claims 23-26 and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 19 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Correa et al.

Correa (Figures 1-6) shows an apparatus and method of attenuating electrostatic discharge comprising a conductive faceplate 14 with an opening 12 and a circular faceplate extension 24 with a slit extending outwardly from the periphery of the opening to form a waveguide wherein optical fiber connector 10, which can receive and/or transmit (transceiver) signals, communicate through the faceplate extension.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2839

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Sikorski, Jr.

Correa et al. shows all the features of this claim as described in Paragraph 3 above except the extension to be rectangular. The instant invention does not provide any reasons or specific problem to be solved by having a rectangular shape. Sikorski shows a faceplate 20 with a plurality of rectangular openings 22, which accepts a plurality of rectangular extensions 30. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the Correa's faceplate extension rectangular because it is one of the other (other than circular) most common configuration as shown by Sikorski.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Terada et al.

Correa et al. shows all the features of this claim as described in Paragraph 3 above except the material of the faceplate extension to be aluminum alloy. Terada discloses the use of aluminum alloy for an optical fiber ferrule holder 51 (Page 7, Paragraph 82). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the Correa's faceplate extension of aluminum alloy because of its linear expansion properties as taught by Terada and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Art Unit: 2839

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al..

Correa et al. shows all the features of this claim as described in Paragraph 3 above except the faceplate extension to project at least 0.2 inches from the faceplate. The instant invention does not provide any specific problem to be solved by making the faceplate projection at least 0.2 inches. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make faceplate projection at least 0.2 inches because a change in size is generally recognized within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

8. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Sikorski, Jr..

Correa et al. shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 3 except a plurality of openings in the faceplate and a plurality of faceplate extensions. Sikorski shows a plurality of openings 22 in the faceplate 20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide a plurality of openings in the Correa et al.'s faceplate and to use a plurality of faceplate extensions because this would require a mere duplication of an essential part involving only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co, 193 USPQ 8.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Sikorski, Jr.

Correa et al. and Sikorski show all the features of this claim as described in Paragraphs 3, 5 and 8 above.

Art Unit: 2839

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Sikorski, Jr.

Correa et al. and Sikorski show all the features of this claim as described in Paragraphs 3, 6 and 8 above.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. in view of Sikorski, Jr.

Correa et al. and Sikorski show all the features of this claim as described in Paragraphs 3, 7 and 8 above.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are not persuasive. Correa (Column 2, lines 54-58) clearly indicates that the extension (nut) 24 provides a conductive path from the tubular member 30 for shielding for electrostatic discharge, and therefore forms an electrostatic waveguide.

***Contact Information***

13. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:


**Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (receptionist)  
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia**

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (703) 308-0977.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached at (703) 308-2710. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or processing should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad  
Primary examiner  
November 24, 2003